

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_105977</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>SEED PRIMING FOR ENHANCEMENT OF SEED QUALITY IN QUALITY PROTEIN MAIZE (QPM) (Zea mays L.,)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, the manuscript is trying to explain effect of priming on seed and seedling</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes. But there are some corrections to be made.</b></p> <p><b>Introduction and materials and method parts are okay but result and discussion needs much improvement. Results were very monotonous, incomplete, not discussed properly. (for detail, Please refer to comments section and also the comment boxes in MS itself)</b></p> <p><b>Yes (for detail, Please refer to comments section and also the comment boxes in MS itself)</b></p> <p><b>Discussion part can be explained elaborately with some more references.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language is okay</li> <li>Result part is very monotonous.</li> <li>Some other improvement is needed which are mentioned in the manuscripts itself (in the comment boxes)</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Below are the few modifications that have to be made by the author/s</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All the modifications that must be made are provided in the manuscripts itself in comment boxes</li> <li>Text in <b>green</b> should be included</li> <li>Text in <b>red and crossed</b> should be deleted</li> <li>In the result only T1, T9 written if possible, Please write the name of the treatment in the bracket</li> <li>In the results and discussion, there is no need to give figure since it represents the data which already presented in the tables.</li> <li>Result and discussion part is very weak. To improve discussion part, role of each parameters (germination, seedling length or dry weight etc.) for better crop growth and yield can be discussed</li> <li>Please explain treatments and varieties separately for all the parameters i.e., which treatment/s were better than control over all the genotypes and which genotype showed maximum improvement.</li> <li>Field emergence parameter is not discussed</li> <li>Since the data is up to 2 decimal points hence All the CD values should also be up to 2 decimal points</li> <li>T2 and T3 of germination% were found to be at par with control. Which treatments were better than control need to be explained</li> <li>In germination- If CD value is taken as 2.03 (up to 2 decimal) 73.07 and 71.04 were found to be at par, which was not mentioned in the discussion.</li> <li>The result writing pattern is very monotonous and not much information is written. Please try to elaborate</li> <li>In the discussion what probable reason might be there for high or low EC should have explained. For other parameters also such explanation should be provided</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Meghali Barua</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Assam Agricultural University, India</b>